arXiv:1410.8567v4 [math.CV] 9 Sep 2015

LIFTING MAPS FROM THE SYMMETRIZED POLYDISC IN SMALL DIMENSIONS

NIKOLAI NIKOLOV, PASCAL J. THOMAS, AND TRAN DUC-ANH

ABSTRACT. The spectral unit ball Ω_n is the set of all $n\times n$ matrices M with spectral radius less than 1. Let $\pi(M) \in \mathbb{C}^n$ stand for the coefficients of the characteristic polynomial of a matrix M (up to signs), i.e. the elementary symmetric functions of its eigenvalues. The symmetrized polydisc is $\mathbb{G}_n := \pi(\Omega_n)$.

When investigating Nevanlinna-Pick problems for maps from the disk to the spectral ball, it is often useful to project the map to the symmetrized polydisc (for instance to obtain continuity results for the Lempert function): if $\Phi \in \mathrm{Hol}(\mathbb{D}, \Omega_n)$, then $\pi \circ \Phi \in \mathrm{Hol}(\mathbb{D}, \mathbb{G}_n)$. Given a map $\varphi \in \mathrm{Hol}(\mathbb{D}, \mathbb{G}_n)$, we are looking for necessary and sufficient conditions for this map to "lift through given matrices", i.e. find Φ as above so that $\pi \circ \Phi = \varphi$ and $\Phi(\alpha_j) = A_j$, $1 \le j \le N$. A natural necessary condition is $\varphi(\alpha_j) = \pi(A_j)$, $1 \le j \le N$. When the matrices A_j are derogatory (i.e. do not admit a cyclic vector) new necessary conditions appear, involving derivatives of φ at the points α_j. We prove that those conditions are necessary and sufficient for a local lifting. We give a formula which performs the global lifting in small dimensions ($n \le 5$), and a counter-example to show that the formula fails in dimensions 6 and above.

1. Motivation and statements

1.1. **Definitions.** Some problems in Robust Control Theory lead to the study of structured singular values of a matrix (denoted by μ). A special case of this is simply the spectral radius. A very special instance of the "μ-synthesis" problem reduces to a Nevanlinna-Pick problem, i.e. given points $\alpha_j \in \mathbb{D} := \{z \in \mathbb{C} : |z| < 1\}$, $A_j \in \Omega \subset \mathbb{C}^m$, $1 \le j \le N$, determine whether there exists Φ holomorphic from $\mathbb{D}$ to Ω such that $\Phi(\alpha_j) = A_j$, $1 \le j \le N$. We refer the interested reader to Nicholas Young's stimulating survey [9].

We study this special case. Let us set some notation.

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 30E05, 32F45.

Key words and phrases. spectral ball, Nevanlinna-Pick, symmetrized polydisc, μ-synthesis, Lempert function.

Let $\mathcal{M}_n$ be the set of all $n \times n$ complex matrices. For $A \in \mathcal{M}_n$ denote by $\mathrm{Sp}(A)$ and $r(A) = \max_{\lambda \in \mathrm{Sp}(A)} |\lambda|$ the spectrum and the spectral radius of A, respectively.

Definition 1. *The* spectral ball Ω_n *is given as*

$$\Omega_n := \{A \in \mathcal{M}_n : r(A) < 1\}.$$

The symmetrized polydisc $\mathbb{G}_n$ *is defined by*

$$\mathbb{G}_n := \{\pi(A) : A \in \Omega_n\},$$

where the mapping $\pi : \mathcal{M}_n \longrightarrow \mathbb{C}^n$, $\pi = (\sigma_1, \ldots, \sigma_n)$, *is given, up to alternating signs, by the coefficients of the characteristic polynomial of the matrix:*

$$P_A(t) := \det(tI_n - A) =: \sum_{j=0}^{n} (-1)^j \sigma_j(A) t^{n-j}.$$

In other words, the k*-th coordinate of* π, $\sigma_k(A)$, *is the* k*-th elementary symmetric function of the eigenvalues of* A.

Problem 2. *(The Lifting Problem).*
Given a map $\varphi \in \mathrm{Hol}(\mathbb{D}, \mathbb{G}_n)$ *and* $A_1, \ldots, A_N \in \Omega_n$, *find conditions (necessary, or sufficient) such that there exists a* $\Phi \in \mathrm{Hol}(\mathbb{D}, \Omega_n)$ *satisfying* $\varphi = \pi \circ \Phi$ *and* $\Phi(\alpha_j) = A_j$ *for* $j = 1, \ldots, N$.

When this happens, we say that the map φ *lifts* through the matrices $A_1, \ldots, A_N$ at $(\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_N)$. An obvious necessary condition for φ to lift through the matrices $A_1, \ldots, A_N$ at $(\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_N)$ is that $\varphi(\alpha_j) = \pi(A_j)$ for $j = 1, \ldots, N$.

Remark 3. *Whenever there is a solution to the Lifting Problem for* α_j, A_j, *then there is one for* $\alpha_j, \tilde{A}_j$, *when* $A_j \sim \tilde{A}_j$ *for each* j, *i.e.* A_j *is similar to* $\tilde{A}_j$, *i.e. for each* j *there exists* $P_j \in \mathcal{M}_n^{-1}$ *such that* $\tilde{A}_j = P_j^{-1} A_j P_j$ [1, proof of Theorem 2.1].

Our first result is a local answer (Proposition 11 in Section 3). Using this and Forstnerič theory, Andrist [2] recently gave a proof that the local conditions are indeed sufficient for a global lifting. However, we provide an explicit formula to perform the lifting when $n \leq 5$ (Theorem 20 in Section 5). The method developed in Section 4 works in a number of other cases (for instances when each of the matrices to interpolate has a single eigenvalue), but fails in general for dimensions greater or equal to 6, as is shown in Section 6.

1.2. **Motivations.** Lifting maps reduces the study of Nevanlinna-Pick interpolation into the spectral ball to a problem with a target domain of much smaller dimension, and bounded. The symmetrized polydisc is *taut*, i.e. any family of maps into it is a normal family. So in particular, if the conditions for lifting are continuous in φ (for instance depending on a finite number of values of φ and its derivatives), we can derive continuity results. In order to formalize this, we use the following notation.

Definition 4. *Given a map $\varphi : \mathbb{D} \longrightarrow \mathbb{C}^n$ and $\alpha \in \mathbb{D}$, the* k-jet *of φ at α is defined as $\mathcal{J}^k_\alpha(\varphi) := \big(\varphi(\alpha), \varphi'(\alpha), \dots, \varphi^{(k)}(\alpha)\big) \in \mathbb{C}^{(k+1)n}$.*

The map $\varphi \mapsto \mathcal{J}^k_\alpha(\varphi)$ is linear and continuous from $\mathrm{Hol}(\mathbb{D}, \mathbb{C}^n)$, endowed with the topology of uniform convergence on compacta, to $\mathbb{C}^{(k+1)n}$.

We give an instance of a continuity result when $N = 2$. Recall the definition of the Lempert function in this context.

Definition 5. *Let $A, B \in \Omega \subset \mathbb{C}^m$, the* Lempert function *is*

$$\ell_\Omega(A, B) := \inf \{|\alpha| : \exists \varphi \in \mathrm{Hol}(\mathbb{D}, \Omega) : \varphi(\alpha) = A, \varphi(0) = B\}.$$

Definition 6. *We say that a matrix $A \in \mathcal{M}_n(\mathbb{C})$ is* cyclic *if it admits a cyclic vector v, i.e. $v \in \mathbb{C}^n$ such that its iterates $\{A^k x, k \geq 0\}$ span the whole space $\mathbb{C}^n$.*

It is well-known that the Lempert function is continuous in both arguments at points (A, B) where both A and B are cyclic. The situation is not as clear when one of the matrices fails to be cyclic (such matrices are called *derogatory*).

The following proposition is implicit in [7, Section 4].

Proposition 7. *Let $A, B \in \mathcal{M}_n(\mathbb{C})$, $\alpha \in \mathbb{D} \setminus \{0\}$.*

Suppose that A is a cyclic matrix.

Suppose that there exist integers $k, p \geq 0$ and a linear map

$$\begin{array}{rcl} \Theta_B : \mathbb{C}^{(k+1)n} & \longrightarrow & \mathbb{C}^n \times \mathbb{C}^p \\ V = (V_0, \dots, V_k) & \mapsto & \Big(V_0, \tilde{\Theta}_B(V)\Big) \end{array}$$

such that: a map $\varphi \in \mathrm{Hol}(\mathbb{D})$ admits a lifting Φ through (A, B) at $(\alpha, 0)$, with $\Phi(\zeta)$ cyclic for $\zeta \neq 0$, if and only if $\varphi(\alpha) = \pi(A)$ and $\Theta_B(\mathcal{J}^k_0(\varphi)) = (\pi(B), 0)$.

Then the map $M \mapsto \ell_{\Omega_n}(M, B)$ is continuous at the point A.

In less technical terms, if A is cyclic, and if B is such that the existence of a lifting of a map φ from the symmetrized polydisc through (A, B), cyclic-valued except for B, is characterized by a finite number

of conditions on the values of φ and its derivatives (at its relevant points), then we have partial continuity of the Lempert function with respect to the first argument at (A, B).

Since Andrist's work [2] (and, in a special case, our Theorem 20) provides a set of conditions as called for in Proposition 7, we now know that the conclusion holds for any matrix $B \in \mathcal{M}_n$ and any dimension n: if A is cyclic, the map $M \mapsto \ell_{\Omega_n}(M, B)$ is continuous at the point A.

Proof of Proposition 7.

The Lempert function is always upper semicontinuous, so we only need to show:

$$\text{when } A_p \to A, \quad \ell_{\Omega_n}(A, B) \leq \limsup_p \ell_{\Omega_n}(A_p, B).$$

Passing to a subsequence if needed, we may choose $\alpha_p \in \mathbb{D}$ such that $|\alpha_p| \geq \ell_{\Omega_n}(A_p, B)$ and $\lim_{p\to\infty} |\alpha_p| = |\alpha_\infty| = \limsup_{p\to\infty} \ell_{\Omega_n}(A_p, B)$, with $\alpha_\infty \in \overline{\mathbb{D}}$. Then there exist $\Phi_p \in \mathrm{Hol}(\mathbb{D}, \Omega_n)$ such that $\Phi_p(0) = B$, $\Phi_p(\alpha_p) = A_p$.

Let $\varphi_p := \pi \circ \Phi_p$. Because $\mathbb{G}_n$ is taut, passing to a subsequence if needed, we may assume that $\varphi_p \to \varphi_\infty \in \mathrm{Hol}(\mathbb{D}, \mathbb{G}_n)$. Clearly $\varphi_\infty(0) = \pi(B)$.

By continuity of the jet map, $(\pi(B), 0) = \Theta_B(\mathcal{J}_0^k(\varphi_p)) = \Theta_B(\mathcal{J}_0^k(\varphi_\infty))$, so there exists Φ_∞ such that $\pi \circ \Phi_\infty = \varphi_\infty$, $\Phi_\infty(0) = B$.

Furthermore, $\pi(\Phi_\infty(\alpha_\infty)) = \varphi_\infty(\alpha_\infty) = \lim_p \varphi_p(\alpha_p) = \lim_p \pi(A_p) = \pi(A)$, and since $\Phi_\infty(\alpha_\infty)$ and A have the same spectrum and are cyclic, $\Phi_\infty(\alpha_\infty) \sim A$. □

2. First reductions of the problem

We need to establish some notations.

Definition 8. *Given a vector $v := (v_1, \ldots, v_n) \in \mathbb{C}^n$, we denote $P_{[v]}(t) := t^n + \sum_{j=1}^n (-1)^j v_j t^{n-j}$.*

This choice ensures that $P_{[\pi(A)]} = P_A$.

Definition 9. *Given $a := (a_1, \ldots, a_n) \in \mathbb{C}^n$, the* companion matrix *of a is*

$$C_{[a]} := \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \ddots & & \vdots \\ \vdots & & \ddots & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & 1 \\ a_n & a_{n-1} & \cdots & a_2 & a_1 \end{pmatrix}.$$

We see that its characteristic polynomial is then $\det(tI_n - C_{[a]}) = t^n - \sum_{j=1}^n a_j t^{n-j}$, so that $\sigma_j(C_{[a]}) = (-1)^{j+1}a_j$, for $1 \leq j \leq n$.

Given a matrix M, the *companion matrix* of M, denoted C_M, is the unique matrix in companion form with the same characteristic polynomial as M.

A matrix $A \in \mathcal{M}_n$ is cyclic (i.e. non-derogatory) if and only if it is conjugate to its companion matrix (for this and other equivalent properties see for instance [6]).

The above computation of the characteristic polynomial of a companion matrix shows that $\varphi \in \mathrm{Hol}(\mathbb{D}, \mathbb{G}_n)$, if we write $\tilde{\varphi} := ((-1)^{j+1}\varphi_j, 1 \leq j \leq n)$, then the map given by $\Phi(\zeta) := C_{[\tilde{\varphi}(\zeta)]}$ is a lifting of φ.

Therefore, in view of Remark 3, this means that lifting through a set of cyclic matrices can be achieved as soon as the obvious necessary conditions $\varphi(\alpha_j) = \pi(A_j)$, $1 \leq j \leq N$, are satisfied [1, Theorem 2.1], [3, Theorem 2.1].

The case where A_1 has only one eigenvalue, and $A_2, \ldots, A_N$ are cyclic, has been studied in [7].

3. Necessary conditions

Let $A_1 \in \mathcal{M}_n$. Up to conjugacy, we may assume that it is in Jordan form. Write this in blocks associated to each of the *distinct* eigenvalues of A_1, denoted $\lambda_k, 1 \leq k \leq s$ where $s \leq n$. Namely

$$A_1 = \begin{pmatrix} B_1 & & \\ & \ddots & \\ & & B_s \end{pmatrix}, \quad B_k \in \mathcal{M}_{m_k}, \quad \sum_{k=1}^{s} m_k = n, \tag{1}$$

where $\mathrm{Sp}\, B_k = \{\lambda_k\}$, and $\lambda_j \neq \lambda_k$ for $k \neq j$.

Temporarily, we fix k and write (B, λ, m) instead of (B_k, λ_k, m_k). We need to set up some notation as in [7]. Let $B = (b_{i,j})_{1 \leq i,j \leq m}$. Then $b_{jj} = \lambda$, $b_{j-1,j} \in \{0, 1\}$, $2 \leq j \leq m$, and $b_{ij} = 0$ if either $i > j$ or $i + 1 < j$.

Let r stand for the rank of $B - \lambda I_m$, so there are exactly exactly $m - r$ columns in $B - \lambda I_m$ which are identically zero, the first, and the ones indexed by the integers $j \geq 2$ such that $b_{j-1,j} = 0$. Enumerate the (possibly empty) set of column indices where the coefficient $b_{j-1,j}$ vanishes as

$$\{j : b_{j-1,j} = 0\} =: \{b_2, \ldots, b_{m-r}\}, 2 \leq b_2 < \cdots < b_{m-r} \leq m.$$

Equivalently, $b_{l+1} - b_l$ is the size of the Jordan block $B^{(l)} := (b_{ij})_{b_l \leq i,j \leq b_{l+1}-1}$. The integer $b_{l+1} - b_l$ is also the order of nilpotence of the block $B^{(l)}$.

We choose the Jordan form so that $b_{l+1}-b_l$ is increasing for $1\le l\le m-r$, with the convention $b_{m-r+1}:=m+1$. It means that the possible zeroes appear for the smallest possible indices j, globally.

Definition 10. *For $1\le i\le m$,*

$$d_i(B)=d_i:=1+\#\{k:m-i+2\le b_k\le m\}.$$

Equivalently, d_i-1 is the number of columns which are identically zero, among the last $i-1$ columns of A_1, or

$$d_i=1+(m-r)-\max\{j:b_j\le m-i+1\},$$

with the agreement that the maximum equals 0 if the set on the right hand side is empty.

One can also interpret $d_j=d_j(B)$ as the least integer d such that there is a set S of d vectors in $\mathbb{C}^n$ with the property that the the iterates of S by B span a subspace of $\mathbb{C}^n$ of dimension at least j (we shall not need this characterization, so we do not include a proof).

Notice that B is cyclic if and only if $d_i(B)=1$, for any i ($b_{j-1,j}=1$ for any j); while it is scalar if and only if $d_i(B)=i$, for any i ($b_{j-1,j}=0$ for any j).

The following proposition gives a set of conditions for lifting which are locally necessary and sufficient. This says in particular that all possible necessary conditions that can be obtained from the behavior of Φ in a neighborhood of $\alpha\in\mathbb{D}$ are exhausted by (2).

Proposition 11. *Let $\varphi\in Hol(\omega,\mathbb{G}_n)$, where ω is a neighborhood of $\alpha\in\mathbb{D}$. Let A_1 be as in* (1)*. Then the following assertions are equivalent:*

(a) There exists $\omega'\subset\mathbb{D}$ a neighborhood of α and $\Phi\in\mathrm{Hol}(\omega',\Omega_n)$ such that

$$\pi\circ\Phi=\varphi,\Phi(0)=A_1;$$

(b) The map φ verifies

$$\frac{d^kP_{[\varphi(\zeta)]}}{dt^k}(\lambda_j)=O((\zeta-\alpha)^{d_{m_j-k}(B_j)}),\quad 0\le k\le m_j-1,1\le j\le s, \tag{2}$$

where the d_i are as in Definition 10.

(c) There exists $\omega'\subset\mathbb{D}$ a neighborhood of α and $\Phi\in Hol(\omega',\Omega_n)$ such that

$$\pi\circ\Phi=\varphi,\Phi(0)=A_1 \text{ and } \Phi(\zeta) \text{ is cyclic for } \zeta\in\omega'\setminus\{\alpha\}.$$

Notice that the condition

$$\frac{d^kP_{[\varphi(\zeta)]}}{dt^k}(\lambda_j)=O(\zeta-\alpha),\quad 0\le k\le m_j-1,1\le j\le s,$$

says exactly that $P_{[\varphi(\alpha)]}(t) = P_{A_1}(t)$, in other words, $\varphi(\alpha) = \pi(A_1)$, which is the obvious necessary condition for the existence of a lifting; and is the only condition that is needed when A_1 is cyclic, that is to say when $d_{m_j-k}(B_j) = 1$ for all j and k.

Clearly condition (c) implies condition (a), so we will only prove that (a) implies (b) (necessary conditions) and that (b) implies (c) (sufficient conditions).

Proof. First, since this is a local result, it is no loss of generality to assume that $\alpha = 0$.

Necessary conditions.

First consider the case where there is only one eigenvalue λ_1 for A_1, i.e. $s = 1$, and furthermore $\lambda_1 = 0$. This is settled by [7, Corollary 4.3], which can be restated as follows.

Lemma 12. *If $\varphi = (\varphi_1, \ldots, \varphi_n) = \pi \circ \Phi$ with $\Phi \in \mathcal{O}(\mathbb{D}, \Omega_n)$, $\Phi(0) = A_1$ as in (1), $\operatorname{Sp} A_1 = \{0\}$ then $\varphi_i(\zeta) = O(\zeta^{d_i})$, where the d_i are as in Definition 10.*

Notice that if we write $P^{(k)}_{[\varphi(\zeta)]} := \frac{d^k P_{[\varphi(\zeta)]}(t)}{dt^k}$ (the derivative of the polynomial with respect to the indeterminate t, not to be confused with derivatives with respect to the holomorphic variable ζ), the conditions above can be written as $P^{(k)}_{[\varphi(\zeta)]}(0) = O(\zeta^{d_{n-k}})$, $0 \leq k \leq n-1$.

If $\operatorname{Sp} A_1 = \{\lambda\}$, then $\operatorname{Sp}(A_1 - \lambda I_n) = \{0\}$. One sees immediately that $P_{A_1-\lambda I_n}(t) = P_{A_1}(t-\lambda)$, so that the necessary condition in the more general case of a matrix with a single eigenvalue becomes:

Lemma 13. *If $\varphi = (\varphi_1, \ldots, \varphi_n) = \pi \circ \Phi$ with $\Phi \in \operatorname{Hol}(\mathbb{D}, \Omega_n)$, $\Phi(0) = A_1$, $\operatorname{Sp} A_1 = \{\lambda\}$ then $P^{(k)}_{[\varphi(\zeta)]}(\lambda) = O(\zeta^{d_{n-k}})$, $0 \leq k \leq n-1$.*

Now consider the general case. To prove (2) for each j, without loss of generality, study the block B_1 associated to the eigenvalue λ_1.

[8, Lemma 3.1] and the remarks following it give a holomorphically varying factorization in some neighborhood ω of 0 of the characteristic polynomial of $\Phi(\zeta)$: for $\zeta \in \omega$, $P_{[\varphi(\zeta)]}(X) = P^1_\zeta(X)P^2_\zeta(X)$, and a corresponding splitting of the space $\mathbb{C}^n$ in a varying direct sum of subspsaces of dimensions m_1 and $n - m_1 = m_2 + \cdots + m_s$, with maps $\Phi_1 \in \operatorname{Hol}(\omega, \Omega_{m_1})$, $\Phi_2 \in \operatorname{Hol}(\omega, \Omega_{m_2+\cdots+m_s})$, such that $P^i_\zeta(t)$ is the characteristic polynomial of $\Phi_i(\zeta)$, $i = 1, 2$; $P^1_0(t) = P_{B_1}(t) = (t-\lambda_1)^{m_1}$; and
$P^2_0(t) = (t-\lambda_2)^{m_2} \cdots (t-\lambda_s)^{m_s}$.

As before, we may consider $P_{[\varphi(\zeta)]}(t-\lambda_1)$ to reduce ourselves to the case $\lambda_1 = 0$. The proof of the necessity of (2) concludes with the following lemma (applied to $k_j := m_1 - d_j(B_1)$).

Lemma 14. *Let $P^0_\zeta, P^1_\zeta, P^2_\zeta$ be polynomials depending holomorphically on ζ, $P^i_\zeta(t) = \sum_{j=0}^{m_i} a^i_j t^j$, $i = 0,1,2$, such that $P^0_\zeta(t) = P^1_\zeta(t)P^2_\zeta(t)$, $P^1_0(t) = t^{m_1}$ and $a^2_0(0) = P^2_0(0) \neq 0$.*

Let $(k_j, 0 \leq j \leq m_1 - 1)$ be a decreasing sequence of positive integers. Then $a^0_j = O(\zeta^{k_j}), 0 \leq j \leq m_1 - 1$ if and only if $a^1_j = O(\zeta^{k_j}), 0 \leq j \leq m_1 - 1$.

Proof. Since P^0 is the product of the other two polynomials, $a^0_j = \sum_{l=0}^{j} a^1_{j-l} a^2_l$. Since (k_j) is decreasing, the hypothesis $a^1_{j-l} = O(\zeta^{k_{j-l}})$ implies $a^1_{j-l} = O(\zeta^{k_j})$, so $a^0_j = O(\zeta^{k_j})$.

Conversely, proceed by induction on j. For $j = 0$, $a^1_0 = a^0_0/a^2_0 = O(\zeta^{k_0})$ since the denominator does not vanish for $\zeta = 0$. Suppose the property is satisfied for $0 \leq j' \leq j-1$. We have $a^1_j = \frac{1}{a^2_0}\left(a^0_j - \sum_{l=1}^{j} a^1_{j-l} a^2_l\right)$, so by induction hypothesis $a^1_{j-l} = O(\zeta^{k_{j-l}}) = O(\zeta^{k_j})$ because (k_j) is decreasing, and since $a^0_j = O(\zeta^{k_j})$, we are done. □

Sufficient conditions.

Using [8, Lemma 3.1] and the remarks following it, applied repeatedly, we find some neighborhood of 0, ω, and a holomorphically varying factorization into mutually prime factors $P_{[\varphi(\zeta)]}(t) = P_{[\varphi_1(\zeta)]}(t) \cdots P_{[\varphi_s(\zeta)]}(t)$, and a splitting of the space $\mathbb{C}^n$,

$$\mathbb{C}^n = \bigoplus_{j=1}^{s} \ker P_{[\varphi_j(\zeta)]}(\Phi(\zeta)).$$

Reducing ω if needed, for each i, $\varphi_i \in \mathrm{Hol}(\omega, \mathbb{G}_{m_i})$. By Lemma 14, it verifies the necessary conditions of vanishing relating to the matrix $B_i \in \mathcal{M}_{m_i}$, with $\mathrm{Sp}\ B_i = \{\lambda_i\}$. So by Lemma 13, there exists $\Phi_i \in \mathrm{Hol}(\omega, \Omega_{m_i})$ such that $\varphi_i = \pi \circ \Phi_i$. The "block mapping"

$$\Phi = \begin{pmatrix} \Phi_1 & & \\ & \ddots & \\ & & \Phi_s \end{pmatrix}$$

yields the desired lifting. □

4. A formula for lifting

4.1. **A modified Jordan form.** First we need a linear algebra lemma giving us a canonical form for matrices, slightly different from the Jordan form and adapted to our purposes. We will call it *modified Jordan form.*

We need to set some slightly modified notations. Let $A_1 \in \mathcal{M}_n$, with $Sp(A_1) = \{\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n\}$: here the eigenvalues are repeated according to their multiplicities. Let $m_1, \dots, m_s$ be the respective multiplicities, set $n_j = m_1 + \cdots + m_j$. Therefore $0 = n_0 < n_1 < \cdots < n_s = n$ and $\lambda_k = \lambda_{k'}$ if and only if there exists $i \in \{1, \dots, s\}$ such that $n_{i-1} < k, k' \leq n_i$.

We assume that $A_1 := (a_{ij})_{1 \leq i,j \leq n}$ is in Jordan form with the notations of (1), except for the labeling of the eigenvalues: now Sp $B_k = \{\lambda_{n_k}\}$.

Lemma 15. *A matrix A_1 as given above is conjugate to $A' = (a'_{ij})_{1 \leq i,j \leq n}$ where $a'_{n_i,1+n_i} = 1 \neq a_{n_i,1+n_i} = 0$, $1 \leq i \leq s-1$, and $a'_{ij} = a_{ij}$ for all other values of the indices.*

Notice that this means that $a'_{ij} = 0$ if $j \notin \{i, i+1\}$, that $a'_{i,i+1} \in \{0, 1\}$ and that if $a'_{i,i+1} = 0$, then $a'_{ii} = a'_{i+1,i+1} \in Sp(A_1)$.

Intuitively, at the junction of two consecutive blocks B_k, we change the coefficient just above the diagonal (and outside the blocks) from 0 to 1.

The new basis that we will find will no longer split the space into invariant subspaces, but we still obtain a triangular form. What we gain is that A' is cyclic if and only if $a'_{i,i+1} = 1$ for all i, $1 \leq i \leq n-1$.

Proof. Let $\{e_j, 1 \leq j \leq n\}$ be the ordered basis in which the original Jordan form is given. Write $V_i := \text{Span}\{e_j, n_{i-1} < j \leq n_i\}$ for the generalized eigenspace for the eigenvalue λ_{n_i}, in other words $V_i = \ker(\lambda_{n_i} I_n - A_1)^n$. Finally, let u be the linear mapping associated to A_1.

The result will be a consequence of the following property, to be proved by induction on j, $1 \leq j \leq n$:

$$(P_j) : \exists v_j \in \bigoplus_{i:n_i<j} V_i \text{ s.t. if } e'_j := e_j + v_j, \text{ then } u(e'_j) = \lambda_j e'_j + a'_{j-1,j} e'_{j-1},$$

with $a'_{j-1,j}$ as defined in the statement of the Lemma. (Here we understand that $e'_0 = 0$ and an empty sum of subspaces is $\{0\}$).

The matrix A' will be the matrix of u in the basis $(v_1, \dots, v_n)$.

We prove (P_j) by induction. (P_1) is trivially satisfied with $v_1 = 0$.

Now assume that $j \geq 2$, and that $(P_{j'})$ holds for $j' < j$. We are looking for v such that

$$u(e_j + v) = \lambda_j(e_j + v) + a'_{j-1,j}(e_{j-1} + v_{j-1}),$$

or equivalently, since $(u - \lambda_j)\, e_j = a_{j-1,j}e_{j-1}$,

$$(u - \lambda_j)\,(v) = a'_{j-1,j}v_{j-1} + (a'_{j-1,j} - a_{j-1,j})e_{j-1}. \tag{3}$$

Case 1. There exists i such that $j = n_i + 1$.

Then $a_{j-1,j} = 0$ and $a'_{j-1,j} = 1$, so (3) becomes $\left(u - \lambda_{n_{i+1}}\right)(v) = v_{n_i} + e_{n_i}$. This last vector is in $W_i := \bigoplus_{i' \leq i} V_{i'}$, which is stable under the linear map $u - \lambda_{n_{i+1}}$. Furthermore, the map $(u - \lambda_{n_{i+1}})|_{W_i}$ does not admit 0 as an eigenvalue, so the equation admits a (unique) solution $v =: v_{j+1}$ in W_i, which is the required space since $n_i < j$, q.e.d.

Case 2. For all i, $j - 1 \neq n_i$.

Then $a'_{j-1,j} = a_{j-1,j}$, so (3) becomes $(u - \lambda_j)\,(v) = a'_{j-1,j}v_{j-1}$, and $\bigoplus_{i:n_i<j-1} V_i = \bigoplus_{i:n_i<j} V_i$. Again, that subspace is stable under $u - \lambda_j$, the restriction of the map is a bijection, so we get a (unique) solution $v =: v_{j+1} \in \bigoplus_{i:n_i<j} V_i$. □

From now on, using Remark 3, we assume that the matrices $A_1, \ldots, A_N$ which we want to lift through are in modified Jordan form, as defined in Lemma 15.

4.2. **Divided Differences.**

Definition 16. *For a polynomial P, the* divided differences *are given recursively by:*

$$\Delta^0 P = P, \Delta^1 P(x_1, x_2) = \frac{P(x_1) - P(x_2)}{x_1 - x_2}, \ldots,$$
$$\Delta^m P(x_1, \ldots, x_{m+1}) = \frac{\Delta^{m-1} P(x_1, \ldots, x_m) - \Delta^{m-1} P(x_2, \ldots, x_{m+1})}{x_1 - x_{m+1}}.$$

Recall that $\Delta^m P(x, \ldots, x) = \frac{1}{m!} P^{(m)}(x)$. A good general reference about divided differences is [4].

4.3. **A meromorphic lifting.**

The following formula gives a "meromorphic" solution to the lifting problem: some of the matrix coefficients are given by quotients which may have poles. Of course, when the singularities are removable, we extend the functions in the usual way, and the properties claimed below extend by continuity.

Proposition 17. *Let Φ be the map from $\mathbb{D}$ (except for some singularities) to $\mathcal{M}_n$ defined by*

$$\Phi(\zeta) := \begin{pmatrix} \phi_{1,1}(\zeta) & f_2(\zeta) & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ 0 & \phi_{2,2}(\zeta) & \ddots & & \vdots \\ \vdots & & \ddots & f_{n-1}(\zeta) & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \cdots & \phi_{n-1,n-1}(\zeta) & f_n(\zeta) \\ \phi_{n,1} & \phi_{n,2} & \cdots & \phi_{n,n-1} & \phi_{n,n} \end{pmatrix},$$

where the f_k, $2 \le k \le n$, and $\phi_{k,k}$, $1 \le k \le n-1$, are holomorphic functions to be chosen, the f_k are not identically zero, and where

$$\phi_{n,\ell} := -\frac{\Delta^{\ell-1} P_{[\varphi(\zeta)]}(\phi_{1,1}, \dots \phi_{\ell,\ell})}{\prod_{k=\ell+1}^{n} f_k(\zeta)}, \quad 1 \le \ell \le n-1, \tag{4}$$

and finally

$$\phi_{n,n} := -\Delta^{n-1} P_{[\varphi(\zeta)]}(\phi_{1,1}, \dots, \phi_{n-1,n-1}, 0) = \varphi_1 - (\phi_{1,1} + \cdots + \phi_{n-1,n-1}).$$

Then $\pi \circ \Phi(\zeta) = \varphi(\zeta)$, for the values of ζ where the quotients make sense.

Let A' be as in the conclusion of Lemma 15, and $\alpha \in \mathbb{D}$. If $f_k(\alpha) = a'_{k-1,k}$, $2 \le k \le n$, $\phi_{kk}(\alpha) = \lambda_k$, $1 \le k \le n$, and $\phi_{n,k}(\alpha) = 0$, $1 \le k \le n-1$, then $\Phi(\alpha) = A'$.

If $f_k(\zeta) \neq 0$ for any $k \in \{2, \dots, n\}$ and $\zeta \in \mathbb{D} \setminus \{\alpha\}$, then $\Phi(\zeta)$ is cyclic for $\zeta \in \mathbb{D} \setminus \{\alpha\}$.

Note that we sometimes omit the argument ζ in $\phi_{ij}(\zeta)$ and other functions. This will happen again.

Proof. The last statement is immediately verified.

To see that $\pi \circ \Phi(\zeta) = \varphi(\zeta)$, we compute $\det(tI_n - \Phi(\zeta))$ by expanding with respect to the last row:

$$\begin{aligned} &= (t - \phi_{n,n}) \prod_{i=1}^{n-1} (t - \phi_{i,i}) - \sum_{\ell=1}^{n-1} (-1)^{n+\ell} \phi_{n,\ell} \prod_{i=1}^{\ell-1} (t - \phi_{i,i}) \prod_{i=\ell+1}^{n} (-f_i) \\ &= t \prod_{i=1}^{n-1} (t - \phi_{i,i}) + \Delta^{n-1} P_{[\varphi]}(\phi_{1,1}, \dots, \phi_{n-1,n-1}, 0) \prod_{i=1}^{n-1} (t - \phi_{i,i}) \\ &\qquad + \sum_{j=0}^{n-2} \Delta^j P_{[\varphi(\zeta)]}(\phi_{1,1}, \dots \phi_{j+1,j+1}) \prod_{i=1}^{j} (t - \phi_{ii}) \\ &\qquad\qquad = P_{[\varphi(\zeta)]}(t), \end{aligned}$$

by Newton's formula applied at the n points $(\phi_{1,1}, \dots, \phi_{n-1,n-1}, 0)$. □

4.4. **Preliminary Computations.**

Lemma 18. *For natural numbers $k \leq j$, the divided difference $\Delta^k t^j$ is given by the formula*

$$\Delta^k t^j(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_{k+1}) = \sum_{\substack{i_1,\dots,i_{k+1}\geq 0 \\ i_1+\dots+i_{k+1}=j-k}} x_1^{i_1} x_2^{i_2} \dots x_{k+1}^{i_{k+1}}.$$

Lemma 19. *Let A_1 be as in (1). Let $\varphi \in \mathrm{Hol}(\mathbb{D}, \mathbb{G}_n)$ satisfy the conditions (2) at $\alpha = 0$.*

(a) Let $\phi_{1,1}, \phi_{2,2}, \dots, \phi_{m_1,m_1} \in \mathrm{Hol}(\mathbb{D}, \mathbb{C})$ with $\phi_{i,i}(0) = \lambda_1$ for $1 \leq i \leq m_1$. Then

$$\Delta^k P_{[\varphi(\zeta)]}(\phi_{1,1}, \phi_{2,2}, \dots, \phi_{k+1,k+1}) = O(\zeta^{d_{m_1-k}(B_1)})$$

for $0 \leq k \leq m_1 - 1$.

(b) Let $\lambda_1 \neq \lambda_2$. Suppose

$$\Delta^k P_{[\varphi(\zeta)]}(\phi_{1,1}, \phi_{2,2}, \dots, \phi_{k+1,k+1}) = O(\zeta^d)$$

for $0 \leq k \leq m_1 - 1$ with $d \geq d_{m_2}(B_2)$. Let $\phi_{m_1+1,m_1+1} \in \mathrm{Hol}(\mathbb{D}, \mathbb{C})$ be any holomorphic function with $\phi_{m_1+1,m_1+1}(0) = \lambda_2$, then

$$\Delta^{m_1} P_{[\varphi(\zeta)]}(\phi_{1,1}, \phi_{2,2}, \dots, \phi_{m_1+1,m_1+1}) = O(\zeta^{d_{m_2}(B_2)}).$$

Proof. To prove (a), we write $P_{[\varphi(\zeta)]}$ using the Taylor formula:

$$P_{[\varphi(\zeta)]}(t) = \sum_{j=0}^{n} \frac{P^{(j)}_{[\varphi(\zeta)]}(\lambda_1)}{j!}(t - \lambda_1)^j.$$

for $1 \leq i \leq m_1$, put $\phi_{i,i} = \lambda_1 + \phi_i$, so that $\phi_i(\zeta) = O(\zeta)$. By linearity of the divided difference operator Δ^k,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\Delta^k P_{[\varphi(\zeta)]}(\phi_{1,1}, \phi_{2,2}, \dots, \phi_{k+1,k+1}) = \\
&= \sum_{j=0}^{n} \frac{P^{(j)}_{[\varphi(\zeta)]}(\lambda_1)}{j!} \Delta^k (t - \lambda_1)^j (\phi_{1,1}, \phi_{2,2}, \dots, \phi_{k+1,k+1}) \\
&= \sum_{j=k}^{n} \frac{P^{(j)}_{[\varphi(\zeta)]}(\lambda_1)}{j!} \sum_{\substack{i_1,\dots,i_{k+1}\geq 0 \\ i_1+\dots+i_{k+1}=j-k}} \phi_1^{i_1} \phi_2^{i_2} \dots \phi_{k+1}^{i_{k+1}} \\
&= \sum_{j=k}^{n} \frac{P^{(j)}_{[\varphi(\zeta)]}(\lambda_1)}{j!} O(\zeta^{j-k}) = \sum_{j=k}^{n} O(\zeta^{d_{m_1}-j(B_1)+j-k}),
\end{aligned}$$

by the conditions (2). It follows from Definition 10 that $d_{j+1}(B_1) \leq d_j(B_1) + 1$ for $1 \leq j \leq n_1 - 1$, so we get, for $k \leq j$, $d_{m_1-j}(B_1) \geq d_{m_1-k}(B_1) - (j - k)$, which implies (a).

To prove (b), we use the Newton interpolation formula

$$P_{[\varphi(\zeta)]}(\phi_{m_1+1,m_1+1}) = \\ = \sum_{k=0}^{m_1} \Delta^k P_{[\varphi(\zeta)]}(\phi_{1,1},\dots,\phi_{k+1,k+1})\cdot(\phi_{m_1+1,m_1+1}-\phi_{1,1})\cdots(\phi_{m_1+1,m_1+1}-\phi_{k,k}).$$

To estimate the left hand side, we may switch the order of the first two eigenvalues, and apply part (a) of the Lemma with $k = 0$ (so the condition $\phi_{m_1+1,m_1+1}(0) = \lambda_2$ is enough), thus we get $P_{[\varphi(\zeta)]}(\phi_{m_1+1,m_1+1}) = O(\zeta^{d_{m_2}(B_2)})$.

By the hypothesis, the right hand side can be written

$$P_{[\varphi(\zeta)]}(\phi_{1,1},\dots,\phi_{m_1+1,m_1+1})\cdot(\phi_{m_1+1,m_1+1}(0)-\phi_{m_1,m_1}(0))(1+O(\zeta))+O(\zeta^d),$$

since $\lambda_1 \neq \lambda_2$ implies that $(\phi_{m_1+1,m_1+1}(0) - \phi_{m_1,m_1}(0)) \neq 0$.

Solving the equation for $P_{[\varphi(\zeta)]}(\phi_{1,1},\dots,\phi_{m_1+1,m_1+1})$ yields the result. □

5. The case where $n \leq 5$

Theorem 20. *Let $n \in \mathbb{N}^*$, $n \leq 5$, $A_1,\dots,A_N \in \mathcal{M}_n$, $\alpha_1,\dots,\alpha_N \in \mathbb{D}$ and $\varphi \in \mathrm{Hol}(\mathbb{D},\mathbb{G}_n)$.*

Then there exists $\Phi \in \mathrm{Hol}(\mathbb{D},\Omega_n)$ satisfying $\phi = \pi\circ\Phi$ and $\Phi(\alpha_j) = A_j$ for $j = 1,\dots,N$ if and only if φ satisfies the conditions (2) for each j, with A_j instead of A_1 and α_j instead of α, for $1 \leq j \leq N$.

Furthermore, the values $\Phi(\zeta)$ may be chosen as cyclic matrices when $\zeta \notin \{\alpha_1,\dots,\alpha_n\}$.

The case $n = 2$ of this theorem is covered by [1] and the case $n = 3$ by [7] and [5].

Proof. Proposition 11 proves the "only if" part of the theorem.

To prove the "if" part, in view of Proposition 17, it will be enough to show that we can choose f_k and $\phi_{k,k}$ such that for each j, they and the entries $\phi_{n,k}$ are defined and assume the correct values at α_j.

Without loss of generality (by Remark 3), we may assume that A_j is in modified Jordan form and we write $A_j = (a^j_{i,l})_{1\leq i,l\leq n}$. A first requirement is that $f_k(\alpha_j) = a^j_{k-1,k}$, $2 \leq k \leq n$, $1 \leq j \leq N$, and $\phi_{k,k}(\alpha_j) = a^j_{k,k} = \lambda_k(A_j)$, $1 \leq k \leq n$, $1 \leq j \leq N$. We also require that $f_k(\zeta) \neq 0$ unless $\zeta = \alpha_j$ and $a^j_{k-1,k} = 0$, and that all of the zeros of each f_k are simple.

Claim. We can determine further conditions (if needed) on a finite number of the successive derivatives of $\phi_{k,k}$ at α_j to ensure that the entries $\phi_{n,k}$, $1 \leq k \leq n-1$, are defined and assume the value 0 at α_j.

If this claim holds, then polynomial interpolation, for instance, lets us find holomorphic functions f_k and $\phi_{k,k}$ satisfying all the above requirements and the conditions in the Claim.

The remainder of the argument is devoted to the proof of the above claim. It will be enough to work at one point $\alpha_j \in \mathbb{D}$, which we may take to be 0 to simplify notations. Likewise the matrix A_j will be denoted $A_1 = (a_{ij})_{1\leq i,j\leq n}$, $n = 4$ or 5, and will be in modified Jordan form. Recall that the conditions (2) already imply that $P_{[\varphi(0)]} = P_{A_1}$.

5.1. **The case** $n = 4$**.** We consider different cases according to the values of $(a_{12}, a_{23}, a_{34}) \in \{0, 1\}^3$. If $a_{k-1,k} = 1$ for all k, A_1 is cyclic and the denominators in the formula for $\phi_{4,k}$ never vanish at $\zeta = 0$; since $\phi_{k,k}(0) = \lambda_k$ which is a zero of $P_{A_1} = P_{[\varphi(0)]}$, $\Delta^{\ell-1}P_{[\varphi(0)]}$ always vanishes at $(\phi_{1,1}, \ldots, \phi_{\ell,\ell})$ for $\ell \leq 3$, and we are done.

If $a_{k-1,k} = 0$ for all k, all the eigenvalues of A_1 must be equal and the proof is (essentially) done in [7, Proof of Proposition 4.1]. In what follows we always assume that A_1 admits at least two distinct eigenvalues.

If there is exactly one value of $k \in \{2, 3, 4\}$ such that $a_{k-1,k} = 0$, then we have an eigenspace of dimension 2, say for $\lambda_1 = \lambda_2$. The corresponding generalized eigenspace, $\ker(\lambda_1 I_4 - A_1)^4$, can be of dimension 2 or 3. Reverting momentarily to the Jordan form, in the first case the matrix splits into two 2×2 blocks with distinct eigenvalues and we may assume $\ker(\lambda_1 I_4 - A_1) = \mathrm{Span}\{e_1, e_2\}$, and $\lambda_1 \notin \{\lambda_3, \lambda_4\}$. In the second case, $\lambda_3 = \lambda_1$ and we may assume $\ker(\lambda_1 I_4 - A_1)^2 = \mathrm{Span}\{e_1, e_2, e_3\}$.

In each case, with the basis vectors being permuted as needed, A_1 admits the following modified Jordan form:

$$A_1 = \begin{pmatrix} \lambda_1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \lambda_1 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \lambda_3 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \lambda_4 \end{pmatrix}, \text{ with } \lambda_4 \neq \lambda_1. \tag{5}$$

If there are exactly two values of $k \in \{2, 3, 4\}$ such that $a_{k-1,k} = 0$, there are two possible cases: in the first case, the two indices k such that $a_{k-1,k} = 0$ are consecutive and we have an eigenspace of dimension 3 (and since there are at least two distinct eigenvalues, the generalized eigenspace is equal to it), so that A_1 admits the following modified Jordan form:

$$A_1 = \begin{pmatrix} \lambda_1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \lambda_1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \lambda_1 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \lambda_4 \end{pmatrix}, \text{ with } \lambda_4 \neq \lambda_1. \tag{6}$$

In the second case, we have $(a_{12}, a_{23}, a_{34}) = (0, 1, 0)$, in which case A_1 admits the following modified Jordan form:

$$A_1 = \begin{pmatrix} \lambda_1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \lambda_1 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \lambda_3 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \lambda_3 \end{pmatrix}, \text{ with } \lambda_3 \neq \lambda_1. \tag{7}$$

Case 1: A_1 as in (5). Since $f_3(0) = f_4(0) = 1$ and f_2 has a simple zero at 0, we need to prove that

$$P_{[\varphi(\zeta)]}(\phi_{1,1}) = O(\zeta^2), \tag{8}$$

$$\Delta^1 P_{[\varphi(\zeta)]}(\phi_{1,1}, \phi_{2,2}) = O(\zeta), \tag{9}$$

$$\Delta^2 P_{[\varphi(\zeta)]}(\phi_{1,1}, \phi_{2,2}, \phi_{3,3}) = O(\zeta). \tag{10}$$

In this case, the conditions (2) tell us that

$$P_{[\varphi(0)]}(t) = (t - \lambda_1)^2 (t - \lambda_3)(t - \lambda_4),$$

and

$$P_{[\varphi(\zeta)]}(\lambda_1) = O(\zeta^2). \tag{11}$$

Applying Lemma 19(a) with $n_1 = 2$, $k = 0, 1$, we get (8) and (9), while, when $\lambda_1 \neq \lambda_3$, we get (10) by applying Lemma 19(b) with $n_2 = 1$. When $\lambda_1 = \lambda_3$, we see that P_{A_1} admits a zero of order 3 at λ_1 and since $\phi_{1,1}(0) = \phi_{2,2}(0) = \phi_{3,3}(0) = \lambda_1$, $\Delta^2 P_{[\varphi(\zeta)]}(\phi_{1,1}, \phi_{2,2}, \phi_{3,3})$ vanishes when $\zeta = 0$, q.e.d.

Case 2: A_1 is as in (6).
In this case, the conditions (2) tell us that

$$P_{[\varphi(0)]}(t) = (t - \lambda_1)^3 (t - \lambda_4),$$

and, since $d_i(B_1) = i$ for $i = 1, 2, 3$,

$$P_{[\varphi(\zeta)]}(\lambda_1) = O(\zeta^3), \quad P'_{[\varphi(\zeta)]}(\lambda_1) = O(\zeta^2). \tag{12}$$

Applying Lemma 19(a) with $m_1 = 3$, we obtain $P_{[\varphi(\zeta)]}(\phi_{1,1}) = O(\zeta^3)$, $\Delta^1 P_{[\varphi(\zeta)]}(\phi_{1,1}, \phi_{2,2}) = O(\zeta^2)$, $\Delta^2 P_{[\varphi(\zeta)]}(\phi_{1,1}, \phi_{2,2}, \phi_{3,3}) = O(\zeta)$. Since f_2 and f_3 have a simple zero at 0, and $f_4(0) \neq 0$, this is what we need for the $\phi_{4,l}$ defined in (4) to vanish at 0, for $1 \leq l \leq 3$.

Case 3: A_1 as in (7).
This is the most complicated case.
In this case, the conditions (2) tell us that

$$P_{[\varphi(0)]}(t) = (t - \lambda_1)^2 (t - \lambda_3)^2, \tag{13}$$

and

$$P_{[\varphi(\zeta)]}(\lambda_1) = O(\zeta^2), \quad P_{[\varphi(\zeta)]}(\lambda_3) = O(\zeta^2). \tag{14}$$

Referring again to (4), we need to prove that

$$P_{[\varphi(\zeta)]}(\phi_{1,1}) = O(\zeta^3), \tag{15}$$

$$\Delta^1 P_{[\varphi(\zeta)]}(\phi_{1,1}, \phi_{2,2}) = O(\zeta^2), \tag{16}$$

$$\Delta^2 P_{[\varphi(\zeta)]}(\phi_{1,1}, \phi_{2,2}, \phi_{3,3}) = O(\zeta^2). \tag{17}$$

To obtain this, we will need to choose adequate values for $\phi'_{1,1}(0)$ and $\phi'_{2,2}(0)$.

Proof of (15)**.**

Put $\phi_{1,1} = \lambda_1 + a$, $\phi_{2,2} = \lambda_1 + b$, where a, b are functions of $\zeta \in \mathbb{D}$. Note that $a'(0) = \phi'_{1,1}(0)$ and $b'(0) = \phi'_{2,2}(0)$.

As in the proof of Lemma 19(a), we have

$$\begin{aligned} P_{[\varphi(\zeta)]}(\phi_{1,1}) &= \Delta^0 P_{[\varphi(\zeta)]}(\lambda_1 + a) \\ &= P_{[\varphi(\zeta)]}(\lambda_1) + P'_{[\varphi(\zeta)]}(\lambda_1)a + P''_{[\varphi(\zeta)]}(\lambda_1)\frac{a^2}{2!} + O(\zeta^3). \end{aligned}$$

By (14), we have $P_{[\varphi(\zeta)]}(\lambda_1) = O(\zeta^2)$, and $P'_{[\varphi(\zeta)]}(\lambda_1)a = O(\zeta^2)$. Furthermore by (13), $P''_{[\varphi(\zeta)]}(\lambda_1) \neq 0$ at $\zeta = 0$. So we can choose $a'(0)$ as a solution of a non-trivial quadratic equation to cancel out the terms of degree 2 in ζ.

Proof of (16)**.**

As in the proof of Lemma 19(a)

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta^1 P_{[\varphi(\zeta)]}(\phi_{1,1}, \phi_{2,2}) &= \Delta^1 P_{[\varphi(\zeta)]}(\lambda_1 + a, \lambda_1 + b) \\ &= P'_{[\varphi(\zeta)]}(\lambda_1) + P''_{[\varphi(\zeta)]}(\lambda_1)\frac{a+b}{2!} + O(\zeta^2). \end{aligned}$$

We have $P'_{[\varphi(\zeta)]}(\lambda_1) = O(\zeta)$ since λ_1 is a double root of $P_{[\varphi(0)]}$, and $P''_{[\varphi(\zeta)]}(\lambda_1) \neq 0$ at $\zeta = 0$. So we can chose $b'(0)$ to cancel out the terms of degree 1 in ζ.

Proof of (17)**.**

Taking $\phi_{1,1}$ and $\phi_{2,2}$ as explained above, we apply Lemma 19(b) with $m_1 = m_2 = 2$, and we find that

$$\Delta^2 P_{[\varphi(\zeta)]}(\phi_{1,1}, \phi_{2,2}, \phi_{3,3}) = O(\zeta^2)$$

for every $\phi_{3,3}$ with $\phi_{3,3}(0) = \lambda_2$. □

5.2. **The case** $n = 5$**.** As in the case $n = 4$, assume that A_1 admits at least two distinct eigenvalues and A_1 is non-cyclic, so in particular there is at least one multiple eigenvalue.

If A_1 admits at least three distinct eigenvalues, A_1 admits the following modified Jordan form

$$A_1 = \begin{pmatrix} \lambda_1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \lambda_1 & * & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \lambda_3 & * & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \lambda_4 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \lambda_5 \end{pmatrix}, \text{ with } \lambda_5 \neq \lambda_1, \lambda_3, \lambda_4 \tag{18}$$

where the stars stand for 0 or 1.

Suppose that $\Phi(\zeta)$ is as in Proposition 17.

Since we always have $\Delta^3 P_{[\varphi(\zeta)]}(\phi_{1,1}, \phi_{2,2}, \phi_{3,3}, \phi_{4,4}) = 0$ at $\zeta = 0$, and $\phi_{5,4} = -\Delta^3 P_{[\varphi(\zeta)]}(\phi_{1,1}, \phi_{2,2}, \phi_{3,3}, \phi_{4,4})$ from (4), it suffices to consider the divided differences up to order 2, and the proof goes through as in the case $n = 4$. The same obtains when $\lambda_1 = \lambda_3 = \lambda_4 \neq \lambda_5$.

Therefore, in this case, it suffices to consider the case where A_1 admits exactly two distinct eigenvalues, each of multiplicity at least 2. So A_1 admits the following modified Jordan form

$$A_1 = \begin{pmatrix} \lambda & b_{12} & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \lambda & b_{23} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \lambda & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \mu & b_{45} \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \mu \end{pmatrix}, \text{ with } \lambda \neq \mu. \tag{19}$$

If there is a cyclic block for λ or μ, i.e $b_{12} = b_{23} = 1$ or $b_{45} = 1$, then we can change the order of the basis vectors to put that cyclic block in the lower right hand corner of the matrix and reduce the proof as in the case $n = 4$. So we only need to consider the case where these two blocks are non-cyclic. In this case, A_1 admits one of the following modified Jordan forms:

$$A_1 = \begin{pmatrix} \lambda & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \lambda & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \lambda & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \mu & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \mu \end{pmatrix}, \tag{20}$$

or

$$A_1 = \begin{pmatrix} \mu & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \mu & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \lambda & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \lambda & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \lambda \end{pmatrix}. \tag{21}$$

Case 1: A_1 as in (20).
In this case, the conditions (2) tell us that

$$P_{[\varphi(\zeta)]}(\lambda) = O(\zeta^3), P'_{[\varphi(\zeta)]}(\lambda) = O(\zeta^2), P''_{[\varphi(\zeta)]}(\lambda) = O(\zeta) \tag{22}$$

and

$$P_{[\varphi(\zeta)]}(\mu) = O(\zeta^2), P'_{[\varphi(\zeta)]}(\mu) = O(\zeta). \tag{23}$$

We need to prove that

$$P_{[\varphi(\zeta)]}(\phi_{1,1}) = O(\zeta^4), \tag{24}$$

$$\Delta^1 P_{[\varphi(\zeta)]}(\phi_{1,1}, \phi_{2,2}) = O(\zeta^3), \tag{25}$$

$$\Delta^2 P_{[\varphi(\zeta)]}(\phi_{1,1}, \phi_{2,2}, \phi_{3,3}) = O(\zeta^2), \tag{26}$$

$$\Delta^3 P_{[\varphi(\zeta)]}(\phi_{1,1}, \phi_{2,2}, \phi_{3,3}, \phi_{4,4}) = O(\zeta^2). \tag{27}$$

To obtain (24), (25), and (26), we will need to choose adequate values for $\phi'_{1,1}(0)$, $\phi'_{2,2}(0)$, and $\phi'_{3,3}(0)$. Note that as soon as we will have chosen these values, (27) will be automatically satisfied by Lemma 19(b), applied with $m_1 = 3$, $m_2 = 2$, and $d = 2$.

Proof of (24). Put $\phi_{1,1} = \lambda + a$, $\phi_{2,2} = \lambda + b$ and $\phi_{3,3} = \lambda + c$. As in the proof of Lemma 19(a), we write

$$\begin{aligned} P_{[\varphi(\zeta)]}(\phi_{1,1}) &= \Delta^0 P_{[\varphi(\zeta)]}(\lambda + a) \\ &= P_{[\varphi(\zeta)]}(\lambda) + P'_{[\varphi(\zeta)]}(\lambda)a + P''_{[\varphi(\zeta)]}(\lambda)\frac{a^2}{2!} + P'''_{[\varphi(\zeta)]}(\lambda)\frac{a^3}{3!} + O(\zeta^4). \end{aligned}$$

From the conditions (22), we find that

$$\mathrm{ord}_{\zeta=0}\left\{ P_{[\varphi(\zeta)]}(\lambda) + P'_{[\varphi(\zeta)]}(\lambda)a + P''_{[\varphi(\zeta)]}(\lambda)\frac{a^2}{2!} \right\} \geq 3$$

and $P'''_{[\varphi(\zeta)]}(\lambda) \neq 0$ at $\zeta = 0$. So we can choose $a'(0)$ as a solution of a non-trivial cubic equation to cancel out the terms of degree 3.

Proof of (25)**.** We have

$$\begin{aligned}\Delta^1 P_{[\varphi(\zeta)]}(\phi_{1,1},\phi_{2,2}) &= \Delta^1 P_{[\varphi(\zeta)]}(\lambda+a,\lambda+b)\\ &= P'_{[\varphi(\zeta)]}(\lambda)+P''_{[\varphi(\zeta)]}(\lambda)\frac{a+b}{2!}+P'''_{[\varphi(\zeta)]}(\lambda)\frac{a^2+ab+b^2}{3!}+O(\zeta^3).\end{aligned}$$

Again, we can choose $b'(0)$ to cancel out the terms of degree 2.

Proof of (26)**.**

$$\begin{aligned}\Delta^2 P_{[\varphi(\zeta)]}(\phi_{1,1},\phi_{2,2},\phi_{3,3}) &= \Delta^2 P_{[\varphi(\zeta)]}(\lambda+a,\lambda+b,\lambda+c)\\ &= P''_{[\varphi(\zeta)]}(\lambda)\frac{1}{2!}+P'''_{[\varphi(\zeta)]}(\lambda)\frac{a+b+c}{3!}+O(\zeta^2).\end{aligned}$$

Again, we can choose $c'(0)$ to cancel out the terms of degree 1.

Case 2: A_1 as in (21)**.**
In this case, the conditions 2 tell us that

$$P_{[\varphi(\zeta)]}(\mu)=O(\zeta^2), P'_{[\varphi(\zeta)]}(\mu)=O(\zeta), \tag{28}$$

and

$$P_{[\varphi(\zeta)]}(\lambda)=O(\zeta^2), P'_{[\varphi(\zeta)]}(\lambda)=O(\zeta), P''_{[\varphi(\zeta)]}(\lambda)=O(\zeta) \tag{29}$$

We need to prove that

$$P_{[\varphi(\zeta)]}(\phi_{1,1})=O(\zeta^3), \tag{30}$$

$$\Delta^1 P_{[\varphi(\zeta)]}(\phi_{1,1},\phi_{2,2})=O(\zeta^2), \tag{31}$$

$$\Delta^2 P_{[\varphi(\zeta)]}(\phi_{1,1},\phi_{2,2},\phi_{3,3})=O(\zeta^2), \tag{32}$$

$$\Delta^3 P_{[\varphi(\zeta)]}(\phi_{1,1},\phi_{2,2},\phi_{3,3},\phi_{4,4})=O(\zeta). \tag{33}$$

Proof of (30)**.** We have

$$\begin{aligned}P_{[\varphi(\zeta)]}(\phi_{1,1}) &= \Delta^0 P_{[\varphi(\zeta)]}(\mu+a)\\ &= P_{[\varphi(\zeta)]}(\mu)+P'_{[\varphi(\zeta)]}(\mu)a+P''_{[\varphi(\zeta)]}(\mu)\frac{a^2}{2!}+O(\zeta^3).\end{aligned}$$

From the conditions (28), we find that

$$\operatorname{ord}_{\zeta=0}\left\{P_{[\varphi(\zeta)]}(\mu)+P'_{[\varphi(\zeta)]}(\mu)a\right\}\geq 2$$

and $P''_{[\varphi(\zeta)]}(\mu)\neq 0$ at $\zeta=0$, so we can choose $a'(0)$ as a solution of a non-trivial quadratic equation to cancel out the terms of degree 2.

Proof of (31)**.**

$$\begin{aligned}\Delta^1 P_{[\varphi(\zeta)]}(\phi_{1,1},\phi_{2,2}) &= \Delta^1 P_{[\varphi(\zeta)]}(\mu+a,\mu+b)\\ &= P'_{[\varphi(\zeta)]}(\mu)+P''_{[\varphi(\zeta)]}(\mu)\frac{a+b}{2!}+O(\zeta^2).\end{aligned}$$

Again, we can choose $b'(0)$ to cancel out the terms of degree 1.

Proof of (32)**.** This follows automatically from (30), (31) and Lemma 19(b).

Proof of (33)**.** As remarked after formula (18), $\Delta^3 P_{[\varphi(\zeta)]}(\phi_{1,1},\phi_{2,2},\phi_{3,3},\phi_{4,4})$ always vanishes at $\zeta=0$.

6. Counter-examples for the candidate lifting when $n \geq 6$

Suppose that $\Phi(\zeta)$ is given by the formula stated in Proposition 17, and that $\Phi(0)=A_1$, with A_1 as described in Lemma 15. In particular we should have $\phi_{n,1}(\zeta)=O(\zeta)$, and we would then have

$$\begin{aligned}\operatorname{ord}_{\zeta=0}(P_{[\varphi(\zeta)]}(\phi_{1,1})) &\geq \operatorname{ord}_{\zeta=0}\phi_{n,1}+\operatorname{ord}_{\zeta=0}(f_2f_3\dots f_n)\\ &\geq 1+d_{m_1}(B_1)-1+\operatorname{ord}_{\zeta=0}(f_{m_1+1}f_{m_1+2}\dots f_n)\\ &\geq d_{m_1}(B_1)+\operatorname{ord}_{\zeta=0}(f_{m_1+1}f_{m_1+2}\dots f_n).\end{aligned}\tag{34}$$

To look for a counter-example, we look for a situation where the above inequality does not occur.

Consider the following matrix of size k

$$B_k^\lambda=\begin{pmatrix}\lambda & 0 & & & & \\ & \lambda & 0 & & & \\ & & \ddots & \ddots & & \\ & & & \lambda & 0 & \\ & & & & \lambda & 1\\ & & & & & \lambda\end{pmatrix}$$

with $\lambda\in\mathbb{D}$. As usual, we understand that there are 0's in the places where no entry is indicated. Put

$$B_k^\lambda(\zeta)=\begin{pmatrix}\lambda & \zeta & & & & \\ & \lambda & \zeta & & & \\ & & \ddots & \ddots & & \\ & & & \lambda & \zeta & \\ & & & & \lambda & 1\\ \zeta & & & & & \lambda\end{pmatrix}$$

with $\zeta\in\mathbb{D}$. Its characteristic polynomial is given by the formula

$$P_{B_k^\lambda(\zeta)}(t)=\det(tI_n-B^\lambda(\zeta))=(t-\lambda)^k-\zeta^{k-1}.$$

Decompose $n = k + l$ with $k, l \geq 3$.

Consider the matrix

$$B = \begin{pmatrix} B_k^{\lambda_1} & \\ & B_l^{\lambda_2} \end{pmatrix}$$

with $\lambda_1 \neq \lambda_2 \in \mathbb{D}$. Put

$$B(\zeta) = \begin{pmatrix} B_k^{\lambda_1}(\zeta) & \\ & B_l^{\lambda_2}(\zeta) \end{pmatrix}.$$

Setting $\varphi(\zeta) = (\pi \circ B)(\zeta)$, we have

$$P_{[\varphi(\zeta)]}(t) = P_{B(\zeta)}(t) = P_{B_k^{\lambda_1}(\zeta)}(t) P_{B_l^{\lambda_2}(\zeta)}(t).$$

Suppose now that we can find a lifting $\Phi(\zeta)$ in the form stated in Proposition 17. Inequality (34) gives the estimate

$$\operatorname{ord}_{\zeta=0} P_{[\varphi(\zeta)]}(\phi_{1,1}) \geq 1 + (k-2) + (l-2) = k + l - 3 \geq k.$$

Since $P_{B_l^{\lambda_2}}(\zeta)(\phi_{1,1}) \neq 0$ at $\zeta = 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} \operatorname{ord}_{\zeta=0} P_{[\varphi(\zeta)]}(\phi_{1,1}) &= \operatorname{ord}_{\zeta=0} P_{B_k^{\lambda_1}(\zeta)}(\phi_{1,1}) \\ &= \operatorname{ord}_{\zeta=0} \left\{ (\phi_{1,1} - \lambda_1)^k - \zeta^{k-1} \right\} \\ &= k - 1. \end{aligned}$$

So this gives a contradiction. One will object that the range of φ may fail to be in $\mathbb{G}_n$. However, $\varphi(0) \in \mathbb{G}_n$, so we can always reparametrize φ by replacing ζ by $\varepsilon\zeta$ with ε small enough.

Acknowledgements. This work was made possible in part by the CNRS-BAS research cooperation project no. 97946, "Holomorphic invariant of domains". We also would like to thank the Polish hosts of the workshop in Bedlewo where the first two named authors started this in 2010; and the Laboratoire International Associé "Formath Vietnam" (funded by CNRS) and the Vietnam Institute for Advanced Studies in Mathematics in Hanoi, which helped the second and third named author collaborate on this topic.

We wish to thank the referee for a careful reading of a first version of this paper, which helped streamline the exposition in many places.

References

[1] J. Agler, N. J. Young, *The two-point spectral Nevanlinna–Pick problem*, Integral Equations and Operator Theory **37** (2000), 375–385.

[2] R. B. Andrist, *Lifting to the spectral ball with interpolation,* arXiv:1501.07145

[3] C. Costara, *On the spectral Nevanlinna-Pick problem*, Studia Math. **170** (2005), 23–55.

[4] C. de Boor, *Divided Differences*, Surv. Approx. Theory **1** (2005), 46–69.
[5] N. Nikolov, P. Pflug, P. J. Thomas, *Spectral Nevanlinna-Pick and Carathéodory-Fejér problems*, Indiana Univ. Math. J., **60** (2011), no. 3, 883–894.
[6] N. Nikolov, P. J. Thomas, W. Zwonek, *Discontinuity of the Lempert function and the Kobayashi-Royden metric of the spectral ball*, Integr. Equ. Oper. Theory **61** (2008), 401–412.
[7] P. J. Thomas, N. V. Trao, *Discontinuity of the Lempert function of the spectral ball*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **138** (2010), no. 7, 2403–2412.
[8] P. J. Thomas, N. V. Trao, W. Zwonek, *Green functions of the spectral ball and symmetrized polydisk*, J. Math. Anal. Appl. **377** (2011), 624–630.
[9] N. J. Young, *Some analysable instances of μ-synthesis*, in: *Mathematical methods in systems, optimization and control*, Operator Theory: Advances and Applications 222 (eds H. Dym, M. de Oliveira and M. Putinar); Springer, Basel, 2012, 349–366.

Institute of Mathematics and Informatics, Bulgarian Academy of Sciences, 1113 Sofia, Bulgaria
E-mail address: nik@math.bas.bg

Université de Toulouse, UPS, INSA, UT1, UTM, Institut de Mathématiques de Toulouse, F-31062 Toulouse, France
E-mail address: pascal.thomas@math.univ-toulouse.fr

Department of Mathematics, Hanoi National University of Education, 136 Xuan Thuy St., Hanoi, Vietnam
E-mail address: ducanh@hnue.edu.vn